

REMARKS**I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Claims 14 – 33 are pending. No claim has been amended.

II. OBVIOUSNESS REJECTIONS

Claims 14 – 26 and 29 – 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over US 3,256,230 (Johnson). Claims 27 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Johnson in view of EP 1146103 (Maekawa). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

First, Applicants disagree with the Office's assertion that "Johnson clearly teaches an embodiment for their invention comprising a blend of copolymers wherein the first copolymer comprises monomers of a homolog of the instantly claimed formula (II) and monomers of formula (Ia) and a second copolymer comprises monomers of formula (I) and [(Ia)]." Office Action, dated 9/25/2007, p. 3. In fact, Johnson teaches a mixture of fluoroalkyl acrylates polymers and a polymer prepared from at least one polymerizable vinylic compound.

Although Johnson suggests that in some instances the fluoroalkyl acrylate polymer could be embodied as a fluoroalkyl acrylate – vinylic copolymer, it does not teach that such a copolymer can be mixed with a C₈₋₂₂ alkyl acrylate / C₁₋₆ alkyl acrylate copolymer as the Office suggests. Applicants point out Johnson does not contain a single example of a copolymer-copolymer mixture. For at least this reason, the claimed invention is patentable over Johnson.

Second, the claimed mixture of fluoroalkyl acrylate / C₁₋₆ alkyl acrylate copolymers and C₈₋₂₂ alkyl acrylate / C₁₋₆ alkyl acrylate copolymers produces a synergistic effect. More particularly, the claimed copolymer mixtures produce a better water repellency on cotton and cotton-polyester fibers than would be expected using each of the copolymers individually. In conjunction with this RCE, Applicants have petitioned for a suspension of examination in order to

further prepare experimental data supporting the unexpected properties of the claimed invention.

For at least these reasons, the Office's rejection of claims 14 – 26 and 29 – 33 is respectfully traversed.

With respect to the rejection of claims 27 and 28, Maekawa also does not teach or suggest a mixture of different copolymers. Applicants note that the Office has stated that "Maekawa is simply relied upon to show that the instantly claimed organic solvents are suitable dispersion agent for applying similar compositions to textiles for the benefits of oil and water repellence." Office Action, dated 9/25/2007, p. 4. Therefore, the rejection of claims 27 and 28 are also respectfully traversed.

III. CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the foregoing constitutes a full and complete reply to the last Office Action which is dated 9/25/2007. Accordingly, Applicants request that the prosecution of this application be reopened, but that any subsequent examination be suspended for a period of three month in order to prepare additional data supporting the patentability of the claimed invention.

The Office is invited to contact the undersigned to facilitate the prosecution or allowance of this application in any way.

Respectfully submitted,

July 25, 2008
Date

/Jimmie Johnson/

Jimmie Johnson, Reg. No. 52485
Synnestvedt & Lechner, LLP
1101 Market Street, Ste. 2600
Philadelphia, PA 19107
Tel: (215) 923-4466
Fax: (215) 923-2189